

NO

492

DOMINION ELECTION.

CAMPAIGN OF 1886.

Hon. Edward Blake's Speeches.

No. 2 (First Series).

Encroachments of the Executive. Inde-
pendence of Parliament. The
Boodle Brigade.

SPEECH AT BEAVERTON.

NOTE.—See Inside Cover for List of Mr. Blake's Speeches in first Series. Apply to W. T. R. Preston, Reform Club, Toronto, for Copies of these Speeches.

Toronto:

HUNTER, ROSE & CO., PRINTERS.

1886.

LIST OF SPEECHES IN THIS SERIES.

- No. 1.—(LONDON): General Review of Situation. Riel Question.
(OWEN SOUND): North-West Maladministration. Riel.
- No. 2.—(BEAVERTON): Independence of Parliament. The Boodle Brigade.
- No. 3.—(CHESLEY): Public Finances—Taxation and Deficits—Farmers.
- No. 4.—(SIMCOE): Federal and Provincial Rights—Ontario—Nova Scotia.
(GUELPH)—Elections near.—Tory Dodges—Nova Scotia.
- No. 5.—(OWEN SOUND): Principles of Liberalism—Duty of the Leader.
(WELLAND)—Policy of the Party—Functions of an Opposition.
(OAKWOOD)—Sir J. Macdonald on Functions of an Opposition.
- No. 6.—*Extracts*—(GUELPH): Home Rule for Ireland.
(BERLIN): Firebrand Tory attempts to excite Germans.
(GALT & ORANGEVILLE): Indian Starvation Policy.
(PEMBROKE): Maladministration felt at Cut Knife Hill.
- No. 7.—*Extracts*—(KENDALL): Business Methods required in Public Affairs
—Degradation of Parliament—A few Boodlers.
(HAMPTON): Civil Service Reform.
(GALT): Burden of Public Debt.
(ORANGEVILLE): Burden of Public Debt.
(BELLEVILLE): Burden of Public Debt—The Interest on Debt.
(OAKWOOD): Burden of Public Debt—Our Public Expenditure.
- No. 8.—(NEWCASTLE): Canadian Pacific Railroad Matters.
(LISTOWEL): Canadian Pacific Railroad Matters—The last Sacrifice of \$10,000,000—Collapse of Tory "Boom" Policy.
(ST. THOMAS): North-West Lands.
(HUNTSVILLE): R.R. Policy—Sir John's Subsidies to "Guinea-Pig" Directors—Assisted Immigration and Railway Frauds.
(PARRY SOUND): Railway Policy of Liberals.
(ORANGEVILLE): Railway Policy of Liberals.
(BRANTFORD): The Kansas Slander.
(LISTOWEL): The Sea of Mountains.
- No. 9.—(WINGHAM): Blake's Tribute to Mackenzie.
(STAYNER): Blake's Tribute to Sir Richard Cartwright.
(BRANTFORD): Blake's Tribute to Paterson—Duty of Young Men.
- No. 10.—(WELLAND): Liberal Party, Creeds and Classes.
(ORILLIA): Leaders and Newspapers—The "Mail" Crusade.
- No. 11.—(AYLMER): Prohibition and Politics.
- No. 12.—(TORONTO): Interests of Labour—The Tariff.
(WELLAND): To Knights of Labour.
(BELLEVILLE): Legislation for Labour.
(DESERONTO): Workingmen and Parties.
(HAMILTON): Workingmen and Parties.
- No. 13.—(HAMILTON): Provincial Issues—The Religious Cry—Liberals and Catholics.
- No. 14.—(LINDSAY): North-West Affairs—Neglect, Delay and Mismanagement—Race and Creed Cries.

BLAKE AT BEAVERTON.

MISUSED MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT.

AN OBSTRUCTIVE SENATE.

Encroachments of the Executive Power.

THE GERRYMANDER. THE FRANCHISE BILL.

Mr. Blake favours

Residential Manhood Suffrage.

VIOLATIONS OF INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

THE BOODLE BRIGADE.

Contractors Testimonials to Ministers.

POLITICAL BONUS HUNTERS.

Boy Beaty's N.W. Central R.R.

Burns' Caraguet R.R.

" Robitaille's Bay des Chaleurs R.R.

" McGreevy's

" Caron's Lake St. John R.R.

Boy Chapleau's Gatineau R.R.

" Pope's Short Line R.R.

" Macarthy's nicely subsidised line.

" Bergin's

" Hickey's

THE BLIND SHARE GANG.

The Timber Limit Industry,

"Lucky Young Men," Sons of their "Pas."

BOODLEUM GATHERUM.

Mr. Blake said :—

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:—I thank you very heartily for the kindness and cordiality of your greeting. In the course of our public lives it must happen to us who are engaged in the fore-front of the battle for the people's rights to pass many gloomy and many discouraging hours; sometimes, perhaps, we are like to faint in the conflict. Our main and substantial support, no doubt, must always be the conscientious conviction that we are in the pursuit of duty. But you add to that support consolation, encouragement, and good cheer when you enable us to reflect, as oftentimes in dark hours I have reflected, that there were many and many a thousand honest hearts who had never seen my face, never heard my voice, never clasped hands with mine, never exchanged with me a friendly greeting, yet still whose pulses beat high not only in zeal for the cause which I was advocating, but also with kindly, aye even partial, affection and good-

will for the man who, whatever his faults and failings, they believed was honestly endeavouring to promote their good. (Loud cheers.) Therefore, in no formal words, but from the bottom of this heart, I thank you for the kindness and encouragement of your greeting to-day.

We, in this country of ours, have a great advantage in one way over those who live in the land from which some of us come, and from which most of us are descended—the old islands beyond the sea—in having as a rule blue and bright skies. But in most things in life there are compensating advantages and disadvantages. In Britain I found that they who were accustomed to cloudy skies and a more weeping climate were not so much afraid of the rain as we who see it more seldom. I have known of many a great assemblage held under circumstances which would have deterred us from turning out in this our more favoured country. I have often thought that many of our people fancied they were made of material which would melt in a shower. (Loud laughter.) I am glad that there are so many thousands here to-day whose zeal the waters could not quench, nor the floods drown, to listen for a brief space while we discuss public affairs of the deepest interest to us all. (Loud applause.) Those who have engaged in these extensive preparations, more extensive, I dare say, than the weather has permitted to be made available, have always this consolation, that they did their part to the uttermost, and that they made every requisite preparation, and if there are some absent who would have been here under more favourable weather, the result is not due to the fault of the managers, but to circumstances over which they had no control. But I will say that I am gratified and surprised at the largeness of the numbers who are here. It is a lesson for the party at large and for each of us present—to do our best and leave the results to the great Author and Disposer of events. We have been accustomed in our time as a party to a good many dark days, to a good many threatening hours, but I rejoice to believe that

THE DAY BREAKS AT LAST,

that a season such as I have not known for many years of disturbance and unrest on the part of those who are opposed to us, and of those who take no active part in politics, and a season of interest, animation and stern determination to do their duty on the part of those marshalled under the Reform banner is apparent, and this is the

BEST OMEN OF OUR COMING VICTORY.

(Vociferous applause.) A long pull, a strong pull, and a pull all together may lead, I believe, to results at the next election which

will surprise even those who are most sanguine to-day. I wish, however, to remind you that in this very riding of North Ontario, as elsewhere, we are labouring under special and peculiar disadvantages, and that even in counties in which

THE GERRYMANDER

did not effect its expected end and object, as it did not here, it is hoped to effect that end by the vexatious complications and difficulties to be imposed upon the people, and particularly upon the Reformers, by the operation of the Franchise Act. And I wish to remind you that no general leader, no local leaders, can do for you the work imposed upon you by these efforts to hamper you. It is your own work; it must be done by yourselves in your local committees, in the various polling sub-divisions of each riding. And I warn you that it is not next year that the election is being run, but now. It will be decided in a few days or weeks in several of these counties. Before I pass to other questions I desire to impress this upon you, and to ask you to rouse yourselves to the effort to see that the organization takes place, even late as it is; that earnest inquiry is made with a view to place every Reform name on the lists, and to

STRIKE OFF EVERY NAME

of our opponents which ought not to be there. (Applause.) There are so many topics which ought to be dealt with that it is impossible to handle them all, or, indeed, to deal with more than one or two. I should like to have spoken to you respecting OUR FINANCES, THE INCREASE IN OUR DEBT, THE INCREASE IN OUR TAXATION, THE TARIFF, THE RATE OF EXPENDITURE, ABOUT THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY, ABOUT NORTH-WEST AFFAIRS GENERALLY, INCLUDING THE MANAGEMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, WHICH HAS RESULTED IN SUCH SCANDALOUS AND HUMILIATING DISCLOSURES TARNISHING OUR FAIR NAME. I should like to have spoken about Provincial rights. I say we in Canada have a

HOME RULE QUESTION,

as well as the people on the other side of the water. Here, as well as there, it is essential to affirm the true principles of federalism, the principle of leaving large local liberties to our several Provinces, that we may create—for I regret to say that it has yet to be created—a true, real, cordial union of hearts and hands in those things common to all through the whole of Canada. (Loud cheers.) I should like to have spoken about economy, and retrenchment, and reform, including the superannuation abuse, and

to contrast the pledges and promises with the practices and performances of the men now in power. But some of these things I have already discussed, and you have the opportunity of knowing what I think of them through the public press. The subject I want to bring before you is of another character—it involves questions connected with

OUR MACHINERY FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT,

for the making of our laws, and the administering of our affairs. No subject can be more important than this. Apply, as I have so often said, a little of the common sense you use in ordinary affairs to public matters. Whether we are machinists, or manufacturers, or farmers, or whatever we may be, we all use machines. If a machine we are using is not constructed on sound principles it will not turn out good work. Moreover a machine requires repairing and oiling from time to time. Improvements are devised from time to time, weaknesses and defects are developed by experience; time brings decay. And these improvements must be adopted; oil must be applied; weaknesses must be remedied; repairs must be made, as we find requisite. The same rules apply to the big machine at Ottawa and the smaller machine at Toronto for legislating on and administering your affairs. They are machines constructed of different materials and on a different principle from those we use in our daily work, and they encounter other difficulties and are susceptible of other weakness, and require other kinds of improvements. But the general rules apply. I will refer first, as its dignity deserves, to the Upper House of our two Houses of Parliament. I say that part of our legislative machinery is not based upon sound principles, and it is not doing its work well. (Cheers.)

THE OBJECT OF A SECOND CHAMBER

under the Federal system, as stated by those who proposed it to the people at Confederation, was the recognition of the State or Provincial entities and interests as distinct from the common entity and interests. These latter were to be represented according to the numbers of the people in the several Provinces, and thus the majority was to prevail in the Lower House. They declared that for that reason the representation in the Senate should be on another principle; on the principle of practical Provincial equality. It has not been accurately carried out in later days, although that has been the substantial aim, in the execution of which Ontario, Quebec, and the three Maritime Provinces grouped together as one, have each equal numbers in the Senate. I say that as a protector of Provincial rights, as an asserter of those principles

which it was intended specially to guard, THE SENATE HAS PROVED A DISMAL FAILURE.

A Voice—We don't want it.

Mr. Blake—How has the Senate proved a dismal failure? How do I justify my statement? In this way: *We have had questions of Provincial rights, of the interpretation of the constitution in this regard; of complaints from one Province and another of difficulties of one kind or other of the special character in respect of which it was said the Senate was to be the guardian, and yet, so far as I know, they have never moved a finger for the protection of the Provinces or for the solution of these difficulties. And why should they? Why, it is absurd. It would be as sensible if you were to determine to give the wolf the power of appointing the sheep-dog who is to protect the sheep against the wolf, and then trust with confidence in the safety of your sheep, as to trust the guardianship of Provincial rights to a Senate nominated under the present system.* (Cheers.) Who is it that can work aggression upon the Provinces or impair Provincial rights? The Ministry of the Dominion, sustained by their majority in the Commons. These are the only persons whose interference you have to dread—the only possible wolves. Who appoint the Senate, the sheep-dogs of Provincial rights? This same Ministry. (Loud cheers and laughter.) And, of course, the men whom they appoint are those who sympathise with their views, men who will do homage to the authors of their legislative being, and will act and vote in accordance with the wishes of these very Ministers whose depredations are to be feared, and against whom the Senate is supposed to be a defender. (Renewed cheering.) There is

ANOTHER FUNCTION THE SENATE WAS ESPECIALLY INSTITUTED TO PERFORM,

that of revising hasty and imperfect legislation, and checking premature legislation. In this respect, also, the Senate, after nineteen years' experience, has been proven thoroughly inefficacious. *I have seen Bills which, even in our hurried and unsatisfactory way of disposing of business in the Commons, had taken long and weary sittings, sent up to the Senate, read the first time, read the second time, referred to Committee of the Whole, passed by Committee of the Whole, reported to the House, read the third time and passed, and sent down to us again almost in as short a time as I have taken to tell the story.* (Loud cheers and laughter.) How much revision is there in that? What is the good of it all? (Loud applause.) But

THE SENATE IS WORSE THAN USELESS,

for it may, at times, be very harmful. It is no good just so long as the machine is under the control and doing the bidding of those who have the majority in the popular chamber; but the moment the people's voice shall reverse that majority and give a majority to the side with whose opinions the majority of the Senate do not sympathise, it is no longer only useless, it may be very dangerous, because it may become a determined obstruction to the exercise of the people's will. I do not tell you that these gentlemen hold their offices by so secure a tenure that they would obstruct for a long time some measure which the people had obviously and firmly, by a large majority, decided to pass, and on which the people had earnestly set their hearts. Because they dare not. They would know that such a course might give rise to an agitation which would sweep their institution out of existence. You know, however, that in the case of the great majority of legislative and administrative acts, the people feel but a languid impulse, feeling strongly upon only a few leading measures. That being the case, the Senate would have it in its power, without great danger to its own existence, harmfully to obstruct the legislation of the House of Commons. *The present plan gives the Tories two chances.* As long as they are in power in the Commons they have the Senate with them, and if they are defeated in the Commons they have still one of the law-making bodies with them; and, if they cannot make the laws, they can by this means prevent the making of the laws which the people's chamber passes. Some of my Conservative friends may say: Well, that seems a good thing; we shouldn't change that; we want to have two chances. In speaking of this point before I have simply asked fair-minded, honest Conservatives to consider the old adage: "Put yourself in his place."

HOW WOULD MY CONSERVATIVE FRIENDS LIKE IT,

if, being in the majority in the Commons, they found themselves thwarted by a body nominated by their opponents? They would say it was bad and wrong. But what would injure them and what would be bad and wrong in their case, injures us and must be bad and wrong in ours as well. It is wrong for us all; and it is simply AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL WAY OF THWARTING THE PEOPLE'S WILL. They sometimes say, "Oh, there is no danger, a nominative body is weak and cannot be presumed to interfere in derogation of the people's rights." But they do interfere with the expression of the people's will. I remember very well when Mr. Joly took

office in Quebec, where they have a nominative Legislative Council, he had not a single friend in that Council. There happened to be two Conservative councillors who had become alienated from their own party, and they gave him some support. But for that he could not have put a Speaker in the chair of the Legislative Council. He would not even have had a man to move a bill in that house. In fact, he would not have been able to obtain a hearing in one of the two law-making bodies of the Province! It was the reduction of the system nearly to an absurdity. *Yet that is what the Senate of the Dominion may come to.* At present the Conservatives have 70 friends to about 14 of the Liberals, and the course of nature will increase this preponderance. Now the Legislative Council in Quebec refused to vote the Supply Bill, the very thing which all agree a nominative body, an Upper House, should least of all touch, and Mr. Joly's Government was actually subverted by that abuse of power. Modern experience has therefore proven that a nominative body may, and does, interfere with the expression of the popular will, and that the reasons thus advanced for the continuance of that body are not sound. *Again, this principle of nominative bodies is inconsistent with the modern democratic theories of the law-making power.* This was one of the main controversies in Quebec before the Rebellion of 1837. One of the principal grievances of which the people complained was that there was a nominative Council which had power to thwart the will of the people, and control the legislation of their representatives. It was out of place then, and it is even more out of place now, and in this democratic country, which ought to be free from all these remnants of feudal and aristocratic notions, that the members of one of the law-making bodies should be appointed by the First Minister and hold office for life. (Loud and prolonged applause.) *No matter how much he may betray his trust, so long as the Senator remains worth a thousand pounds, and can drag his limbs for a single instant once in every two years into the Senate Chamber, so long he holds his place as a maker of laws for you and me, and we cannot get rid of him.* I say that is a principle absurd on the face of it, and utterly indefensible in respect to the law-making power, and I maintain that if there is to be a second chamber it ought to be in some manner elected by the people, and in some manner responsible to the people in whose name and on whose behalf it is to make the laws to which we are all called upon to render a cheerful obedience—(loud applause)—and until that is established it cannot be said that we are really a self-governing people. I think, therefore, we ought to have

A SECOND CHAMBER OF REDUCED NUMBERS—I SAY OF REDUCED NUMBERS,

because that would avoid a considerable portion of the expense, besides diminishing the danger of collision between the more numerous and more popular body and the second or revising Chamber. I think we ought to have that Chamber appointed by election in one form or other, and, though at one time I rather inclined to another view, *I believe the best mode is by direct popular election.* (Cheers.) It is said that there may be danger in that of a dead-lock, because the Senate will be elected as well as the House of Commons, and will claim equal powers. You may have a dead-lock at any moment under the present system, and it would, of course, be possible under the directly-elective system. But there are many ways of obviating that difficulty—for example, the over-riding vote, the joint vote, the vote by a specified majority, the decisive vote after a session or after an election, a declaration as to the constitutional function of the body—the question has been solved and solutions have been suggested in many ways in various countries. The argument respecting that difficulty ought not, therefore, to prevail. My good friend behind me here, said a little while ago, while I was speaking of the Senate, “We don’t want it.” I am not prepared to adopt that view. (Applause.) *The example we have had in Ontario of conducting the affairs of a single Province with a single Chamber is certainly cheering and encouraging; but I maintain that the conduct of the affairs of a Dominion made up of several Provinces is a very different matter.* Besides, I cannot forget it was

• PART OF THE ORIGINAL COMPACT

of Confederation, devised in the interests of the smaller Provinces, that there should be a second Chamber, in which the smaller Provinces should have a larger proportionate representation than they would have in the Lower Chamber, where the number was based upon the population. Therefore, I am not prepared to propose—still, less am I prepared to propose as a member coming from the largest Province, one having great numerical weight in the Lower House—that we should abrogate that pact, and take away that supposed safeguard of the smaller Provinces. Just so long as they conceive the possession of that supposed safeguard is of advantage to them, our best course, as statesmen, is to continue this portion of our legislative machinery on the principle on which it was originally introduced, making such changes as will add to its efficiency and guard against its obstructiveness, and

such is the policy of the Liberal party as proclaimed in Parliament and on the platform, and as we ask the people to ratify it at the polls. (Loud applause.)

I come now to

THE LOWER HOUSE,

of which I am a member, and in whose concerns you are chiefly interested. *The Tory policy has been and is to give to the Executive, and to remove from the people and the House all the control they can in reference to the making of the House.* You remember that when Mr. Mackenzie came into power, in conformity with his avowed principles, he deprived himself of the power the Tories had assumed after Confederation, of appointing, as they pleased, the Returning-officers at elections. He said:—I prefer not to avail myself of this power; I will act upon this view at the first election, and as soon as comes a session of Parliament, if I am returned, I will settle it for all Governments by legislation. So

WE RESTORED TO LOCAL OFFICERS

in your midst, to officers having duties to perform as citizens, and being men whose character, respectability, efficiency, and standing in society, ought to be guarantees of their good conduct, the functions of Returning-officers, though the vast majority of these men throughout Canada at that time were political opponents, or had been appointed by political opponents of ours. The Tories did not object to that change, but agreed to it, and it was carried out with the unanimous consent of Parliament. But no sooner did the Tories resume office

THAN THEY REPEALED THE LAW

and resumed the power of appointing the Returning-officers. They said:—It was a good thing to allow the other rule while our opponents were in power, because it gave us many friendly Returning-officers. But now that we are back in power we will take again the power to appoint only our friends to these offices, and the influence due to their being our appointees. We can appoint the registrars or sheriffs when they suit us; they will owe the office to us, and will not be ungrateful, and when they don't suit us we can appoint other people who do. Abuses have existed in the past in this matter. My friend and your friend, the member for this riding, Mr. Cockburn, experienced one of these abuses. I remember when it was my duty to call upon the House, as a matter of privilege, to amend

A SCANDALOUS RETURN MADE BY A RETURNING-OFFICER,

who chose not to return our friend, though he had been fairly elected. I succeeded. The Government found that they were dealing with a new Parliament, and a good many of their followers were not yet hardened by the constant process of voting for the wrong. After having denounced me as the proposer of dangerous motion, subversive of correct principles, they were obliged to yield, and your present member was duly returned. (Loud cheers.) His case is an example of *the danger of allowing the Government to nominate the Returning-officers* who are to choose between them and their opponents. Remember this, that *the Government ought to be given as little power with reference to an election as possible, because the Government is one of the parties to that election.* Both parties ought to be on an equality. A case is to be tried, and the country is jury. If you give one party to a case power which affects the choice of the jury there is little chance of justice being done. Do not give to the Government in political affairs, powers you would be the first to reject if proposed to be applied in the case of a dispute in the ordinary affairs of life. (Cheers.) Again, with reference to the

VOTES OF THE CIVIL SERVANTS.

We have objected to the Civil Service vote as at present managed, not because the Civil Servants are not respectable people. But we do not believe in any vote that is not a free vote. "Franchise" means freedom, and if you give a man the franchise, and tell him how he must use it, you simply offer a case of contradiction of terms. I brought forward this case of Mr. Dodd, to which Mr. Edgar referred, in which *a member of Parliament by his own letter, was shown to have gone to a public officer and told him during an election that he ought to vote for the Government candidate, because he was the Government candidate, and because if he did not so vote he would run the risk of being turned out of office, for that was the rule.* His own letter proved that he had used those words. But *the man voted according to his own conscience, and not according to the bidding of his assumed masters, and he suffered the penalty, not by being in form deprived of his office, but by being shuffled out of it by a cunning device* which I need not stop to describe, but the result of which to him was by the member's letter expressly ascribed to his vote—in truth it was *because of his impudence in using his franchise freely.* They said he had taken an active part in the elections. I know nothing about that. The threat and the complaint made by the member was with reference to his voting simply, nothing more. I made my charge against

the member, and against the Government, for I declared that the Government, knowing the circumstances, had carried out the plot, and had in effect deprived the man of his office, and the Tory party in the House refused the committee of investigation for which I had asked. I would like to know, if this is the system, whether you think these are free votes or not. It is a

SCANDALOUS ABUSE OF POWER,

but it is only another instance of the Tory policy of controlling elections and electors, instead of making them free.

Take another case. There was an election for the county of Kings, Prince Edward Island. The Liberal candidate had a majority of about 86 votes. But the Tory Revising-officer made a double return. Somebody had put in a protest against the Liberal candidate, saying that he had been a member of the Local Legislature, and had not effectually resigned. The matter was brought up in Parliament, and notwithstanding our protest, it was referred by vote of the Tory majority to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. And that Committee decided by a party vote, not that the man who received a majority should be declared elected, not that the election was void and should be contested again; but that the man who had received a minority of votes, the man whom the people had rejected, should be declared elected, and should represent that county for the whole life of the Parliament. And the Tory majority in the House of Commons confirmed that verdict. We objected, and urged that the man who had the majority should be given the seat. If there was any irregularity he could be unseated in the regular way. But they refused. We said: Suppose that you are right, and that he is disqualified, that is no reason why the other man should have the seat; void the election and let it be contested again. But they refused that also. We asked them to refer the matter to the Supreme Court and not to insist that a political body, in which they were a majority, should decide a point of law. No, they said; we are bound to decide it ourselves. And *they did decide it themselves, these righteous judges, and they decided it for themselves, and I have been sitting for four years with a colleague in Parliament whom the Tory members of the House elected in spite of the people's verdict.* (Loud cheers.) Add to this the case of Sir Charles Tupper, whom, though his seat was voided, and he was ineligible for Parliament, they elected for Cumberland by Act of Parliament—(cheers)—and tell me whether these things should so be? Then we come to

THE GREAT GERRYMANDER,

by which they determined to control the popular vote of Ontario. They determined so to affect the bounds of the different ridings

that a practical popular equality on the gross polls should not be reflected by an equality in Parliament, but that a popular equality of votes should be represented in Parliament by a great Conservative majority, and a small Liberal minority. I need not talk about that in detail here. You know what was done in Ontario and Muskoka, what was done in the Simcoes and the Yorks. (Cheers.) I believe there are men from every one of those counties here. Desperate efforts were made by the Reformers, animated by that zeal which results from a sense of crying injustice and gross fraud perpetrated upon a people, and from a stern determination to redress the wrong. Some Conservatives, I rejoice to say, gave but half-hearted support to their party, and some went in opposition to it on account of

THIS INIQUITOUS MEASURE.

But you must not forget the dead weight so placed upon the Liberal party, though they were enabled in spite of it to gain victories here, in South Ontario, in North York, in East York, and elsewhere. (Cheers.) They were unable over the whole Province to overcome the effect of the gerrymander, and eight seats which they held by right were taken, while many more were nearly taken by the Tories. However, eight or ten seats were saved to us on which the Tories counted as confidently as on those they won, but which the superior zeal and earnestness of the Reformers, and the candour and shame of a good many of their own supporters, prevented them from securing. (Cheers.) What was the result after all? It was this, that while we had at the polls almost an equality of the people, within one of an equality on a due return, we had in the House a majority of eighteen against us. I warn you that you must

DISPLAY ONCE MORE THAT DESPERATE ZEAL AND ENERGY

in every county which has been mutilated, if you would succeed in the next contest. They count on a diminution of your zeal. They say: "The Reformers will no longer be animated by that burning sense of injustice that drove them to superhuman efforts before, and, as for the Conservatives, we know them well. They are, on the whole, a carefully disciplined body. A few were slack, and fewer still were hostile, but now that the thing is done and cold, they will fall back into our ranks, and labour in the gerrymandered counties as well as ever." I look to you to defeat that expectation by continuing the zeal you showed before. I look to the Conservatives whose love of justice and fair play led them to abstain, or to take part with us before, to defeat that expectation of a relapse from probity, integrity, and high-mindedness, by

showing that they are still possessed of those qualities. (Cheers.)
I want to say a word with reference to

THE EASTERN PART OF OUR PROVINCE.

That part of the Province is often misunderstood by Reformers in the West. It is true that we have been unable to return many members for the East, because the divisions of ridings, even as they were before the gerrymander, were wholly unjust to us. Notwithstanding our small representation in Parliament, the eastern part of Ontario, from the county of Durham to the border, contains a very large number of intelligent, hard-working, high-spirited Reformers—and I can prove it by the returns of the last election. I wish to make the eye help the ear in this matter, and I have prepared a little checker-board, on which you will see the result of the popular vote in the thirty seats from Durham to the border in the year 1882. The squares are, as you will see, pretty nearly black and white alternately. It is true there is one black one in excess of the white. I hope my Conservative friends will not mind if I say that in this little map they are represented by the black and the Reformers by the white. (Loud laughter.) I have not painted them very black, but still a good many shades blacker than the others. (Renewed laughter.) This shows

THE STATE OF THE POPULAR VOTE

at the last elections. In those thirty constituencies there were enough Reform votes to have elected (making allowance for acclamations and exceptional conditions) sixteen Conservatives and fourteen Reformers. That is what the people said at the polls, and all we ask is that the voice of the people at the polls shall be fairly echoed in Parliament, and if we are in a minority at the polls we are quite content to remain in a like minority in Parliament until we can convince enough people that we are right, to give us a majority. (Cheers.) This shows what the people said, and this (here the speaker turned the paper over) is what the returns to Parliament said for the same district. (The reverse side of the picture was received with loud laughter.) There you have a great black sea, with a little white island in the middle. Only three Reformers were elected, though we should have had fourteen; and twenty-seven Tories, though they should have had only sixteen. This is what happened, but there might easily have been worse and more of it; for if the Tories had managed to turn 150 votes in these three ridings which returned Reformers, they would have made them return Tories, and the little white island would never have appeared above the surface, although our proportion of the popular vote would not have been noticeably affected. We

would still have fourteen-thirtieths of the votes, without one single member to represent them. Even in a case like that

THE GERRYMANDER WAS OPERATED.

One would have thought that in Eastern Ontario, where they had already enormous advantages—where they could count on over twenty seats as things stood, far in excess of their rights—shame and decency would have prevented the Tory majority in the House from altering the bounds to hurt us still more. One would have thought they would have been contented with having all the seats but eight or so, when they ought to have had only sixteen to fourteen, but they were not. They took from the County of Carleton, a Tory stronghold, a township or two, knowing they could spare them from Carleton, and added them on to North Lanark, so that my friend, Mr. Macdonnell, who got a majority of 200 votes in his old riding, was defeated by 80 votes through the tacking on of these other townships. They added the Tory township of Kitley to the constituency of Brockville, and by that means they turned a majority of 80 against them in the old riding into a majority of about five in their favour in the new creation. So to the man that had much, more was given; and from him that had not, was taken away even that which he had. (Laughter.) *From me, who should in justice have had fourteen supporters, and would have had five, at any rate, on the old boundaries, all were taken away but three!* And that is what a free people approve of and admire. They do not deserve to continue free! (Cheers.)

THE COMMONS OUGHT TO BE A MIRROR OF THE PEOPLE

at large, politically. If it is so, it is a truly representative body; but if you debase it into a machine to be artificially arranged by one party to represent its opinions, even when they are not the opinions of the people, you prostitute it to the vilest party ends—you deface the fair form of representation; you destroy its substance, and you may as well give up its theory.

I refer to another thing. The Tories have not only taken the appointment of the Returning-officers, manipulated the Civil Service vote, and carved up the districts so as to secure the best possible results for themselves, but these things not succeeding to their entire satisfaction,

THEY PROPOSE BY THE FRANCHISE ACT TO TAKE ANOTHER STEP.

The Federal system in its nature points to the Provincial franchises as the true franchise for the Commons House of Parliament. You must remember the principle of representation in the Lower

and popular body, as established by Confederation, is that each Province shall be represented according to the number of souls that inhabit it. The men who are in the best position to say how the mind of the Province shall be most accurately represented are the people of the Province themselves, and the form which they choose for that representation for their own Local House is the form which should be adopted for Federal purposes. (Cheers.) That is the plan pursued under the constitution of the greatest example in ancient or modern times of a country established upon the federal principle—the United States of America. Our own experience pointed to the same course, for we had been eighteen years under that system, and I have yet to learn of the first man who showed, or could show, that any substantial grievance existed. There are other reasons. Our country is large, extending over four thousand miles. It is inhabited by different people of different races, different creeds, different conditions as to occupation, realized wealth, prosperity and advancement, and with different views. How can we best be sure that the mind of each section shall be fully represented in the House of Commons? Certainly by adopting the method which the people of each section have chosen for themselves. Any effort to establish

A CAST-IRON PRINCIPLE OF UNIFORMITY MUST RESULT IN REAL DIVERSITY,

because if you apply the same system to different conditions the result must be diversity, and not uniformity. Again, one of the first rules which ought to animate a self-governing people is that you *should impose as little labour, expense, and difficulty as possible upon those who desire to get their names on the list of voters, or to keep them there, and to exercise their franchise.* A double franchise, a double list, double machinery for making the lists, and different systems of appeal—all this means enormous expense. THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS WE VOTED LAST SESSION ON ACCOUNT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE FRANCHISE ACT FOR THE YEAR. We do not know how much more it is going to cost. They can't even tell us how much the printing is to be. *They make jobs of this printing, giving it to their supporters at high prices—prices in many cases, as I am informed, twice and thrice what like work has been done for, and admitted to be largely in excess of the cost of the Ontario lists.* They cannot tell us what they are going to pay the revising officers. We asked that question the session before last. They said they could not tell, but that next session they would bring down a measure which would fix the rate. We asked this session what the rate was to be, but they said they had not decided. *They do not tell these revising officers, who are to be so*

thoroughly independent of both sides, what their pay is to be. They say to the revising officers in effect: According to your work so shall your reward be. (Cheers.) Neither public nor revising officers are to know how much, or on what principle, they are to be paid. But this is not all, or nearly all, the cost of the Act. The largest part is

THE COST TO THE PEOPLE THEMSELVES,

the actual money cost of revising the list, of putting names on and striking off those that should not be there, the loss of time, labour, and money to members of Parliament, to candidates, and to active party men. *Even the loss of time is enormous*, and it is all a loss to the country, for the men who spend their time thus are obliged to give up their ordinary avocations which increase the wealth of the country. *I want to see the cost of getting into Parliament made as cheap as possible.* (Loud cheers.) I don't want to see a plutocracy established in this democratic country. *I don't want to see the law so arranged that only he who is a rich man, who can afford to spend hundreds of dollars to get names on the list, may aspire to represent the people.* (Cheers.) I want to see the avenue kept open so for all those who deserve to reach the goal, no matter whether their purses be light or heavy, and I warn you that so long as you choose to have a system which is expensive and complicated, and so long as you do not like—and I suppose few do—to pay the expenses yourselves, so long you are putting a tax or duty upon the man who has a light purse, and giving an advantage or protection to the man with a heavy purse, in the race for legislative honours. (Cheers.) Then, again, the system of making the lists leaves less power with the people, and gives more power to the Government, and is all wrong.

IN ENGLAND WHO MAKE THE LISTS?

Local officers appointed by local administrative bodies, whose members are chosen by the people as in Ontario. This is one of the most valuable features of British institutions, this system of minor local boards, and it is very useful to give dignity and importance to these minor boards, such as must be given by entrusting them with the making of the lists for the great national elections. BUT OUR GOVERNMENT SAYS:—WE CANNOT TRUST THE MUNICIPAL COUNCILS TO APPOINT THE PROPER OFFICERS TO MAKE THE LISTS, OR TO ATTEND TO THE REVISION. WE MUST APPOINT INDEPENDENT MEN, WHO WILL NOT BE CORRUPT, WHO WILL NOT BE PARTISAN, WHO WILL DO THE FAIR THING, WHICH OUR MUNICIPAL COUNCILLORS AND LOCAL ASSESSORS CANNOT BE TRUSTED TO DO. WE, ONE PARTY IN THE PARLIAMENT, ONE PARTY TO THE

CONTEST, IN ORDER TO SECURE EVEN-HANDED JUSTICE, AND PERFECT FAIR PLAY TO THE PEOPLE AT LARGE, WITH THAT HIGH PURPOSE, AND NO OTHER, OF COURSE, WE WILL TAKE THESE APPOINTMENTS INTO OUR OWN HANDS. THEY SHALL BE OUR OFFICERS. WE WILL NAME THEM SO THAT IT MAY BE PERFECTLY CERTAIN THAT THEY WILL DECIDE AGAINST US WHEN THEY OUGHT. (Loud cheers and laughter.) I never said that the municipal councils or assessors always did what was right in this matter. But I say, take it by and large the whole Province over, that, as far as my experience goes, the lists were made and revised with reasonable fairness under the officers appointed by the municipal councils and the municipal councils themselves. (Cheers.) There were some exceptions, of course, and they were to be deplored, but, take it as a whole, there was no general cause of complaint respecting the system of making or revising the lists, and there was an efficient and cheap appeal in cases of injustice. *The Government not only names the man to make the lists, but names the man to revise them—and they are the same man.* (Laughter and applause.) The man who has made the list, and has declared as to the right of so-and-so to be on the list, must hear the appeal upon that case and decide it. I would rather have some other person declare whether the officer was right or wrong than himself. The English Government never dared to propose to the English Parliament that they should be empowered to name the persons to revise the lists. *The English Ministers are men of high station, in conspicuous places before the world. They are actuated, as a rule, by pure motives, and would, if any would, be perhaps hardly likely grossly to abuse such a trust.* Yet they

NEVER DARED TO SAY TO PARLIAMENT:

Give us the power to name the men who are to revise the lists. What do they say? They say: Give the high judges of the land, while sitting in the courts administering justice, and as connected with their administration of justice, when they hold the great Court of Assize for the county, give them the appointment of the Revising-officers. *No partial man, no partisan, no politician, no party to the contest does this in England, but a judge of the highest court, holding a most exalted office for other functions, elevated above the mists and passions and prejudices of partisanship, sworn to do his duty, and doing it amongst the people and under their eyes, whose prime condition of life is that he should do justice in everything in which he officially acts.* Here our partisan Ministers are so much more exalted above partisanship, so much more to be trusted, that what no English Ministers ever dared to ask the English Parliament to commit to them, and what the English

Parliament would have refused had it been asked, is asked for by the Canadian Ministers and granted by the majority in the Canadian Parliament, knowing, doubtless, that that was FOR THEM THE EASIEST ROAD BACK TO PARLIAMENT. (Loud cheers.) I make no charges against the whole body of Revising-officers, but I do say that in some cases most

IMPROPER APPOINTMENTS HAVE BEEN MADE.

Take one instance, that of the County of Carlton. That is the Prime Minister's own riding. In the election of 1882 he had a lawyer as his financial agent, a man occupying the most intimate and confidential relation to himself necessarily, a man entrusted with looking after his receipts and disbursements and his interests during the election. That man has been appointed by the Prime Minister to revise the voters' lists in that county. (Cheers and laughter.) Will that appointment change him? Partisan last election, this time he is so far removed above party that he is to revise the lists on which everything depends. I don't know whether he is going to be financial agent again; I suppose not. That would be too great an outrage upon decency for even this Government to be guilty of. But I think it an outrage upon decency as it is. When you can find such things in the case of the Prime Minister, you can take that sample and judge of the rest. (Cheers.) But I say that improper appointments have been made, and improper persons made judges, and needless judgeships created, to serve this fraudulent purpose. We have had a good deal of trouble already, and I fear we shall have more. We have had

NAMES ILLEGALLY PUT UPON THE LIST

by the hundred—in one division of Toronto I am told they have been thus put on by the thousand. They had no right to be there, but they were put on in the expectation that a law would be passed this session legalizing them, and so prevent their being taken off. They were put on at almost no expense, but the Reformers have to go to great expense to take them off. They tried to legalize it all. They brought in a clause which, if passed, would have kept on the list the names thus illegally put on. And they would have passed that clause, but that the Liberals showed a determination to stay until the fall if necessary, and fight the question out, and that being so they thought better of it, and withdrew it rather than provoke such a contest. (Loud cheers.) But they suspended the operation of a clause by them brought in, which, if it had effect, would have lightened our load a good deal. Under this clause a man whose vote was objected to was obliged

to attend at the final revision without pay, or run the risk of having his name struck off. Being forced to withdraw the provision which would have legalized the names wrongfully put on the list, they determined to suspend this latter clause until after the next revision. But why? Surely what is to be good then cannot be bad now. (Cheers.) Why? Because they had an enormous advantage, and would make that advantage less if we could compel the attendance of these men without paying them. And so

WITH REGARD TO THE FORM OF OATH.

Your old form of oath was some guarantee and protection in case men were wrongfully put on the list. At first they brought down a form of oath of that kind, but after reflection and consideration, and after finding the condition of the lists, they struck it out and brought in another under which a man whose name is wrongfully on the list might vote without having to swear that he was entitled to vote. They knew they had large numbers on the lists who could not take an oath declaring that they were qualified, and so they withdrew what they had first proposed, and left us without that protection. As to the franchise, I would not seek to force my views respecting the franchise upon any other Province, for I believe that each Province should be allowed to deal with this matter for itself. (Cheers.) Take the great question of

FEMALE SUFFRAGE.

In Ontario a great many people are in favour of the suffrage for women. (Loud applause.) In Quebec a very large majority are determinedly hostile to the principle of giving the suffrage to women. Why should Ontario force suffrage for women upon Quebec? (Cheers.) Why should Quebec insist that the people of Ontario should not give the women of the Province the franchise if they desire it? (Renewed cheers.) Let each Province decide for itself. (Loud applause.) By giving the greatest freedom in this respect you avoid friction and conflict, and get each Province fairly represented. But I have declared in the House, and I repeat it here, that if there is to be a Dominion franchise, inasmuch as the Dominion does not touch questions relating to property, and having regard to our system of taxation, under which every man who is not a pauper must pay a share through the Customs, and having regard also to our system of defence, I SHOULD FAVOUR, AS THE ONLY SENSIBLE DOMINION FRANCHISE, RESIDENTIAL REGISTERED MANHOOD SUFFRAGE. (Loud and prolonged cheering.) It would be the simplest and plainest; it would make no very serious difference with reference to the character of the franchise; it would avoid

the complications, doubts, uncertainties, and in a large measure the expense of the present system. (Loud and prolonged applause.)

I now come to another and most important question—

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

I have spoken of the principles upon which the parts of our legislative and administrative machine should be selected. But, after you have the machine so far put together, you must see that it is so regulated as to do its work properly. After electing your members to Parliament, you must see that the conditions of action will lead them to do their duty. The relations of the Executive and of members of Parliament to the public treasury, and to public contractors, must painfully press themselves upon the mind of every Canadian who has at heart the honour of his country, the respectability of its Executive, and the independence of its Legislature. It is necessary always to take precautions for the avoidance of corruption. You know who it was that said,

“A GIFT BLINDETH THE EYE,”

and in all times a principal danger to popular institutions has arisen from the corruption of those who were charged with the people's business. Our country is a country of workingmen, of those who themselves earn the bread they eat, and not a country of wealthy men. A moment ago I said that *the avenues to the legislative halls should be freely open to those who live by the labour of their hands or of their brains*. But it would not be prudent, it would not be common sense not to consider, as people in other lands have had to consider, and to guard against the dangers naturally growing out of the situation. There are temptations with reference to money, wealth, patronage, office, which, in the nature of things, more seriously affect people in our pecuniary circumstances, which more seriously affect us who are not absolutely beyond the reach of want, affect us who are dependent upon our continued exertions for the maintenance of ourselves and our families, than they do the man who is very wealthy; not, God forbid! not because the poor man is of a less noble nature—it is not so—but because his circumstances, in the very nature of things, intensify the temptations in his case. So in wealthy England, and still more here, IT HAS BEEN MADE PLAIN THAT WE MUST SCRUTINIZE CAREFULLY THE RELATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE AND OF MEMBERS WITH CONTRACTORS AND WITH THE TREASURY. Laws have been made with regard to some of these relations, and these laws have been made more stringent from time to time as abuses were shown to grow up. The custom of Parliament has also been a protection,

for we have our customs—of late, I regret to say, not very strictly observed—which make certain prohibitions in these regards. But the main safeguard, after all, is and must be public opinion. (Applause.) We must evince a lively and determined public opinion; we must express the general view of people of all sides, and from all quarters, *that the public man, as a prime condition of retaining the public confidence, must keep himself*

NOT MERELY FREE FROM REPROACH,

but free from cause of suspicion, must thrust far from him, as an accursed thing, even the very appearance of evil, must have nothing to do with any transaction of which it can be said, not even that it did affect, but that it was calculated to affect unfairly his public conduct. Unless you lay that down as your rule, if you think that because it is the action of some one of your own party you ought to approve, that because it suits your party purposes to permit these doubtful, these dangerous, relations, you will suffer them to exist, you degrade your Parliament, and you degrade yourselves. (Cheers.) How shall we gain the best security for

PERFECT FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE OF ACTION

on the part of our Executive and Legislature? This question is before us to-day. Take the case of your school trustees. They live amongst you and are constantly under the full force of local public opinion. You elect them yearly and can punish them quickly. You know what the law with regard to them says. Now, human nature is the same in the narrow sphere of the school trustees' action as in the great machine at Ottawa. What says the law to the school trustees? Here is what the Act says:—

"Any trustee who has any pecuniary interest, profit or promise or expected benefit in, or from, any contract, agreement or engagement, either in his own name or in the name of another, with the corporation with which he is a member, or who receives, or expects to receive, any compensation for any work, engagement, employment, or duty on behalf of such corporation, shall *ipso facto* vacate his seat, and every such contract, agreement, engagement, or promise shall be null and void, and the remaining trustees, or a majority of them, shall declare the seat vacant, and forthwith order a new election."

You bind them tightly and justly, for though a man may not in the slightest degree be affected because he is interested, still it is not likely, it is not human nature, that he should be unaffected, for "a gift blindeth the eye." And in your choice you consider whether a man has kept, not merely the letter, but also the spirit of your law. This is a disagreeable subject. Our political con-

troversies on public questions are bitter enough in tone. They are far bitterer than I like them to be. I have a great desire that we should conduct our political discussions in measured and moderate language, with proper regard for the feelings, opinions, views, aye, even the prejudices of our opponents, and that we should live as good citizens, good neighbours, and good friends in private life, though we may differ as to public questions. But when personal questions are introduced, political bitterness is, doubtless, intensified. Still, I believe with those who have preceded me that it is a duty, though a painful duty, a duty from which I have often shrunk, to speak and speak aloud on this subject.

YOUR MINISTERS ARE THE CHIEF CRIMINALS,

for they themselves offend, and they are the cause of offence in others. An old and very gross case of improper dealing was that which arose in 1872, with reference to an intending contractor for the Canadian Pacific Railway, Sir Hugh Allan, when enormous sums were, at the solicitation of Sir John Macdonald and another leading member of his Government, paid to Sir John, to that member, and to Sir Hector Langevin, to be used in the elections, on a promise and understanding between the parties with reference to the arrangements for the chartering of the Pacific Railway Company, under the powers conferred on the Executive at their request by Parliament. I say that is a

GREAT AND NOTORIOUS CASE OF ILL-DEALING.

But there is one difference between that case and some of the other cases which have been referred to lately. The large sums received from Sir Hugh Allan were obtained, gentlemen, to buy you—(cheers)—to buy the electorate of Canada. They were not obtained, it is said, and I believe truly said, to put into the pockets of either the Ministers or members for their own use; they were simply to buy the electorate, and thus to secure the retention by the buyers of their offices and salaries. I do not know whether the distinction commends itself to you as one very favourable to the parties. I don't know whether you will be more or less insulted by the idea that the electorate was to be bought through the contractors' fund, and the Ministry so to retain its place, or by the idea that members of Parliament and Ministers are to be chosen not exclusively to serve the public interest, but to use their positions to benefit themselves. The distinction is made, and if it be any credit or advantage to the Conservative party I am quite willing to give it to them. (Laughter.)

THE CRIME WAS GREAT,

whatever the distinction, and should have been much more severely punished than it was. After a comparatively brief exile from power these men were restored to office, and *though at the first blush they had been downcast*, and many of their friends had been ashamed and humiliated at the disclosures, *yet that happened which often happens*, FOR THE PATH OF SHAME IS DOWNWARD, AND IT IS EASY—they all agreed at last to declare all this to be a slander and a calumny, and *that there never was any Pacific Scandal at all. They have since then bettered their instruction ; they have confided in your lenity, in your forbearance, in your approbation of these methods of conducting public affairs, and have gone further, without, as yet, faring worse.* Whether they shall fare worse or not depends upon the next appeal to the people. Another case was the gift, several years ago, to the present First Minister, by means of

A SETTLEMENT UPON HIS FAMILY,

of the sum of about \$80,000, which was subscribed for and presented to him or to his family while he was First Minister of Canada. It was so SUBSCRIBED AND PRESENTED LARGE-
LY BY ACTUAL AND INTENDING CONTRACTORS, whose business it was to obtain favourable contracts from the Government, and having obtained them to get the largest prices for the least returns, and the most liberal allowances for extras that they could manage. It WAS SUBSCRIBED LARGELY ALSO BY PUBLIC CORPORATIONS GREATLY INDEBTED TO THE TREASURY, and dependent upon the Executive for favourable settlements of their indebtedness and favourable adjustments of their financial relations. I will refer to one instance, that of the

NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY

of Canada. That Company was indebted in an enormous amount to the Government of Canada. It was a bankrupt concern, and acknowledged its inability to pay its debt. It was calling upon the Government to ask Parliament to compromise the debt and to take for it a comparatively small sum. And while that was the relation of the Northern Railway Company to the people, and to the Parliament, and to the Government of Canada, they FOUND MONEY OUT OF THEIR POVERTY, out of their bankrupt exchequer, out of that exchequer which they declared could supply only a small composition on their debt to the public, TO PAY \$2,500 TOWARDS THE TESTIMONIAL TO THE FIRST MIN-

ISTER. (Cheers.) There was not money to pay you, but there was money to subscribe for him. What happened? That which you might expect to happen. Shortly afterwards a Bill was brought in by this same Government for the relief of the Northern Railway—(applause)—under which it was proposed to accept in full a small proportion of the debt. It came down very late in the session. Mr. Mackenzie, the leader of the Opposition, objected to the concession, and insisted that it was too late in the session to press such a bill, and declared that if it was pressed he would fight it. (Applause.) The terms were too favourable to the company, which should have been required to pay more. I heard the First Minister tell Mr. Mackenzie that he ought not to resist the Bill; that he would be responsible before the people for obstructing wise and useful legislation, and that the people would condemn him for it. (Laughter.) However, Mr. Mackenzie took the responsibility. (Cheers.) He was not a man to flinch from responsibility; and he thus defeated the measure. (Renewed cheers.) What ensued? *Mr. Mackenzie attained office a year or two later, and he had to deal with this question, the settlement of which he had prevented on the terms proposed. His Government made a settlement with the Northern Railway Company \$500,000 better than the settlement which was proposed by Sir John Macdonald, which we had obstructed. We saved the public that amount. (Loud cheers.) But we received no testimonial from the Company. (Cheers and laughter.)* I could give you other instances of those who subscribed to this testimonial and what their relations with the Government were, but one is perhaps enough for a sample. You will understand that *in the bulk of cases the settlements between Governments and contractors are so covered up that the facts cannot be got at, and this makes it all the more important to prevent these relations between the Executive and contractors.* Well, all this was approved of. It was thought to be rather an unhandsome thing to say anything about it. It was a matter to be silently agreed to. It gives me great pain, I confess, to have to refer to these matters, but the circumstances are such to-day that we are bound to point out to what these things will grow if you do not check them. The thing was approved or condoned, and two or three years ago the Minister of Public Works,

SIR HECTOR LANGEVIN, GOT HIS TESTIMONIAL TOO.

Why not? What is right for the chief is right for the second in command. He, it is true, has to do with the great bulk of the contracts for public works. He largely decides upon the conditions of tendering, advertises for the tenders, determines which

tender shall be accepted, determines whether the contractor has performed the work. He it is who gives the instructions for changes, who settles the bills for extras, which allow the greatest latitude for favourable or unfavourable settlement. He, I say, even above the others, ought to avoid, as a thing utterly abominable, any relations, except the direct business and official relations, with the contractors who have or may have business with his Department. THE TESTIMONIAL HE RECEIVED WAS ABOUT \$20,000, and it was largely subscribed by public contractors who had claims against the Government, or hopes or expectations whose realization depended almost wholly upon his favourable decision. Many of these claims have since been settled. What has happened? This has happened—that many people suspect the Minister of Public Works of having been influenced in his decisions by the relation he allowed to exist between these contractors and himself as givers and recipient of a large and valuable present. It may or it may not have been so. No man can tell. We cannot judge. God knoweth! But the position is wholly indefensible. *To no public man ought it to be possible to say: With one hand you took from this man a testimonial, and with the other you settled his claim.* (Cheers.) Then we had the

CASE OF THE MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE.

The Minister of Public Works' testimonial passed off very well. (Laughter.) The people did not seem to object very strongly. The Tory party thought it all right. And so the Minister of Inland Revenue received his testimonial in the shape of a house and furniture, also largely subscribed for by public contractors and others with whom, as a member of the Government, he had relations, and as to the furniture, very largely by the civil servants of whom he was a superior officer. These I regard as very improper relations between a Minister and contractors, and between a Minister and the civil servants who are, in a certain sense, his subordinates and dependents.

THE CASE OF SIR JOHN'S DIAMONDS.

Then, sir, this very year, we have our very greatest public contractors, we have the principal magnates of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, a corporation having enormous financial relations with the Government, and at a time when an application was to be renewed which the Government had last year declined, an application for the cancelling of ten millions of dollars of their indebtedness to the country in lieu of a portion of their land subsidy, we have these magnates making to the lady of the First Min-

ister very valuable presents, the cost of which is variously stated. From the best information available I have believed it was at least \$15,000, but I see that the *Mail* newspaper declared the other day that the value was only \$5,000. I do not know whether the value was the price of one good farm or of three, but either is enough to condemn the transaction. (Applause.) In my opinion it was a most unfortunate thing that the First Minister, in view of the relations of the Company and his Government in times past, in times present, and in expectancy, should have suffered such a thing to occur. (Applause.) No gift of an important and valuable character such as this should have been accepted. What happened? The session came on, and the application of the Company, which had been rejected by the Government last year, was proposed by the First Minister himself this year. No doubt it may have been solely his sense of right and justice, it may have been solely his desire to promote the public interest that induced the change of opinion. I hope it was so. We cannot judge. That is just the difficulty. The unfortunate and indefensible relation was created, and the impression that all was not right was naturally produced. Gentlemen, these things ought not so to be. (Applause.) It is discreditable to us as a people that they exist, and exist, apparently, with the approval of one of the great parties in the State. There is

ANOTHER CLASS OF CASES

in which both Ministers and ordinary members are concerned, but in which the guilt of Ministers, as their power and responsibility are higher, must be deemed even graver than the guilt of ordinary members. When Ministers act as these have done, depend upon it members will follow suit. When the great and the high-placed in our land stoop to indefensible positions their examples will be followed all too fast. The path downward is easy and rapid, and if those who should be exemplars of public morality, public integrity, and public probity, who ought to be men above suspicion, place themselves in suspected positions, can you expect that others not so highly placed will not act in a similar spirit? Take the

RAILWAY GRANTS.

I say, and I say it with extreme regret, that a system has grown up—it is not an isolated case—a system has grown up under which the grants in aid of railways, whether out of the exchequer in money or out of the public domain in lands, the grants which give value to the charters, which give a price to the stock and bonds, which give a possibility of gain or increased gain to those who have control of the charters—UNDER WHICH THESE GRANTS

AND THE CHARTERS AND POWERS GIVEN BY PARLIAMENT ARE TRAF-
FICKED IN BY MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT FOR PERSONAL GAIN. I
do not object to a public-spirited member of Parliament taking
an honest interest, as a public man, in railway development. Let
him labour as hard as he pleases as member for the development
of his county or his country. *But I do object to a pretence of pub-
lic interest being used to cover private interest.* I do object to the
admixture of private gain with the public duty. I do object to
members, not railway builders or railway contractors, knowing
no more about railways and having no more interest or concern
in them than the bulk of you to whom I speak, becoming ardently
interested in these enterprises, not so much for the promotion
of the enterprises themselves as for the accomplishment of schemes
under which large and valuable concessions shall be made tribu-
tary to their own pockets. *If your representatives are to be suf-
fered to enter into such relations with enterprises to which value
is thus to be given through the public exchequer or the public
domain,*

THERE IS AN END OF ALL NOTION OF PARLIAMENTARY INDEPENDENCE

or integrity. Take the NORTH-WEST CENTRAL as an instance.
This was a railway in the North-West which was at first in the
hands of a non-political body of business men. They found some
difficulty in concluding the arrangements they wished to make
with the Government, and they thought it expedient to find fa-
vour with the powers that be. What was their plan? *They took
Mr. James Beaty, member of Parliament for West Toronto, and
put into his hands, mainly for his own personal use, a majority
of the stock, or \$286,000 of stock on which ten per cent. had been
paid, making \$28,600, but for which he paid nothing. They said :
You take charge of this ; we want the land grant and the loca-
tion, and you are the man to push them ; you are a member and
a supporter of the Government. He took it up. He made*

A POLITICAL BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

He put on MR. BUNTING, the late candidate in West Durham
against myself, THE EDITOR AND MANAGER OF THE *Mail*, a very
influential man in Tory politics. He put on MR. HAY, HIS COL-
LEAGUE for the Centre Division of Toronto. These were the poli-
tical directors for Ontario. Then he went to Quebec. He took
MR. BILLY and MR. RIOPEL, TWO WHOLE-SOULED CONSERVATIVES,
who, like that well-known American character, were "for the old
flag and an appropriation every time." He put these on the
Board to represent the Tory political element of Quebec. He
took MR. WOODWORTH, THE MEMBER FOR KINGS, N.S., to repre-

sent the Tory political element of the Maritime Provinces. And he took MR. NORQUAY, THE TORY PREMIER OF MANITOBA, to represent the Tory political element of the North-West. Thus these seven Tory politicians were banded together, and, having duly arranged the Board, the merits were laid before the Government in a paper signed by them, and

WHEN THE LAND GRANT WAS SO APPLIED FOR OF COURSE IT WAS GRANTED.

(Applause.) What else could you expect when such powerful representations were made by such powerful men? (Hear, hear.) I am not considering now the expediency of the land grant. I am pointing out the process which was found advisable in order to secure it, and the inevitable results of that process. Soon afterwards the grant at a price was found to be insufficient for the purpose, and they pressed that the grant should be made free. At first the arrangement was that the company should pay \$1 per acre for 6,400 acres per mile of the road. If their request were conceded, and the land grant made free, it would make them better off by \$6,400 a mile than they had been before. They applied for the free grant.

THEN CAME A LITTLE HITCH.

Mr. Woodworth said to Mr. Beatty: I don't like the way things are going on. It seems to me you are not recognizing my interests. It was agreed that you and I were to divide all the profits, after giving a certain sum to be divided among the other directors. Unless you recognize that plainly, so that I may know you mean to act up to it, I shall deem it my duty to use my influence to stop the free land grant. AND THE LAND GRANT WAS STOPPED. It did not come down to the House among the other free land grants that session. It was only provided for by Order-in-Council some time after Parliament had closed the session, when, as I assume, the influence of the other politicians had overcome Mr. Woodworth's. I must do Mr. Woodworth the justice to say that after having considered the consequences of this kind of transaction, he openly declared that he saw it was a mistake, and expressed his intention to have nothing further to do with them. I rejoiced to hear that manly declaration: after it my mouth is closed with reference to the part he took before without due consideration, a part which he obviously now regrets. If more of those who have blindly engaged in these enterprises, under evil influences, without seeing the mischief of following the

EXAMPLE SET THEM IN HIGH PLACES,

had followed in his footsteps, I would be better pleased, and would welcome home the wanderers who were finding their way back to the right path. He has seen that private interests are likely to be paramount when the pocket is on one side and duty on the other. You see it too. May we all see it while yet there is time!

Mr. Beaty turned Mr. Woodworth out. He alleged that no such understanding existed as was alleged. I do not know who is right; that question I leave to be settled between themselves. It is of no consequence to us. MR. BEATY INTRODUCED in his room another gentleman, THE MEMBER FOR PICTOU, N.S., MR. TUPPER, to represent the Tory political interest in the Maritime Provinces. I desire to do justice to the member for Pictou. He was told, it appears, that the free land grant had been obtained, that there was no more to ask, no more to expect from the Government, that all was settled, and that there were no delicate relations of that kind between the Government and the company. But when the revelations of last session were made, Mr. Tupper at once wrote a letter to Mr. Beaty, stating that he had become a member of the Board on an understanding which had turned out inaccurate, and he resigned his seat at the Board. That act did Mr. Tupper honour. (Cheers.) *But if Mr. Tupper's conduct is thus to be commended, what are we to say of the other Parliamentary directors of bonus-hunting railway companies? Can we praise him without blaming them? I doubt not Mr. Tupper disliked to do what he yet felt needful to do, and disliked it because his act was a condemnation of those who did otherwise. Measure their corn in the same bushel as Mr. Tupper measured his, weigh them in the balance which he used when he refused to sacrifice his position and his integrity by remaining in the company, and what will be the result? (Applause.) The corn will be found short in the measure, the men will be found wanting in the balance.*

Well, Mr. Beaty, got his free grant, and then went arranging, negotiating, financing, seeking capitalists who would undertake to build the road, but always with the intention of getting

"SOMETHING FOR THE BOY."

(Cheers and laughter.) I do not mean that he intended to get anything for one individual boy—the boy Beaty—apart from his co-shareholders. They were all the boy, but he was the biggest boy of the lot. His share would be the greatest. There is nothing

ing to show, apart from the Woodworth squabble, that he intended to cheat his partners in the deal, and I do not suppose he did. But he wanted too much for the boy, and like many other people who try to get too much, he got nothing. But \$675,000, or something like that, was the sum which Mr. Beaty virtually proposed should be ultimately realized by himself and a few others. Some of the people to whom he went said :—" We will build the road, but we cannot give this amount of tribute to your people ; there is not that much money for the boy." So Mr. Beaty went on financing and negotiating, going to this man and that, and always looking after his public interest as member of Parliament, of course ; but always also casting sheep's eyes in the direction of some scheme which would give a little " boodle for the boy." (Laughter.) From time to time he wanted concessions from the Government, and of course he got them. Was he not member for West Toronto, with six influential Tory supporters at his back ? But the whole murder came out, and it was impossible for Mr. Beaty to go on. He has lost his chance, he has lost his expectations, and, worst of all, I am afraid he has injured his reputation as well. (Hear, hear.)

ALL THIS IS APPROVED OF BY THE TORY PARTY.

No, I ought not to say that. It is approved of by the Tory Ministers and the Tory members of Parliament. Whether it will meet the approval of the party has yet to be found out. We asked for an inquiry into these transactions. We asked for delays. We asked the Government not to grant the indulgences craved by Mr. Beaty and his associates on any terms, showing them that they should not extend privileges to men who had so abused their positions as members. But THE GOVERNMENT HAS LAID IT DOWN AS PART OF THEIR PLATFORM THAT THESE TRANSACTIONS ARE HIGHLY MERITORIOUS, and that it is a good thing that members of Parliament should be interested personally in the prosecution of these bonused railway enterprises. *They think there are not enough railway contractors, not enough business men and capitalists, not enough active, energetic men amongst the four or five millions of the population of Canada to carry out these enterprises, and that the country will suffer loss if your 211 members of Parliament are precluded from lining their pockets by means of public enterprises which owe their value to the action of the Executive.* (Loud applause.) I say it is an absurdity ; I say,

KEEP THEIR HANDS OFF ;

I say, let your representatives keep their hands out of the public chest, directly and indirectly. (Loud cheers.) Don't be gulled

by this idea with which they seek to impress you. If these men are going to interest themselves in these enterprises on public grounds, let them do so on public grounds alone; let them interest themselves without having any pecuniary relations with the Government or with the companies, and *let the money part of it be left to men not in Parliament, to men not charged with duties which demand their absolute independence of the Executive.* These men were not any of them railway builders or contractors; they were lawyers, doctors, manufacturers, and, above all, politicians. *This is an industry which has suddenly been largely developed in Canada.* Whether it is a wholesome and useful industry, that of members of Parliament engaging in public works of this kind, which owe their value to the public grants to be made by their leader, judge ye! Let me give you

ANOTHER CASE.

There was a charter for a railway through Gloucester, New Brunswick, the Caraqueet Railway. The company got a cash subsidy of \$3,200 a mile, went on and built a considerable mileage, and last session, just at the end of the session, for that is the time when these grants are proposed, down came over thirty grants to railways, amongst them one of \$3,200 a mile for ten more miles of

THE CARAQUET RAILWAY.

I said to the Government:—Will you please lay upon the table the papers which show the applications for these grants? Yes, they said, and some they did. When that grant came up, I said:—I see this application is signed by a person of the name of Burns. Can you tell me if that is any relation to the hon. member for Gloucester? “Oh,” said the First Minister, “that is the member for Gloucester. He has been very energetic and very enthusiastic about building this railway, and it is greatly to his credit. Had it not been for his energy and enthusiasm the road would never have been built.” Very likely, I said; for here is another little paper, a list of the stockholders of this railway, and it shows that

MR. BURNS OWNS ELEVEN OUT OF EVERY TWELVE SHARES

in the company, so that *out of every \$1,200 proposed to be granted by this Government, \$1,100 goes into his own pocket.* (Loud cheers and laughter.) *And I believe he has paid nothing on his stock.* Why shouldn't he be enthusiastic, energetic, and persevering? (Cheers and laughter.) If you could arrange for a bonus \$1,200 to go to the improvement of your own farm and your neigh-

bour's, \$100 to go to your neighbour, and \$1,100 to yourself, no doubt you would be energetic and enthusiastic, too. (Cheers and great laughter.) Then there was

ANOTHER CASE,

that of the BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY COMPANY. The Government has given to that company \$620,000. The bulk of the stock is held by half a dozen men. The largest shareholders are SENATOR ROBITAILLE, MR. RIOPEL, M.P.; MR. M'GREEVY, M.P., AND SOME OF THEIR RELATIONS AND INTIMATE FRIENDS, all Tory politicians, holders of the bulk of the stock, say eleven-twelfths. They receive the bulk—say eleven-twelfths—of these enormous subventions by virtue of their relations to the Government. I believe the cash they invested was a paltry ten thousand dollars all told in stock. Then take the

CASE OF THE QUEBEC & LAKE ST. JOHN RAILWAY.

They had already received enormous subventions, and last session more was given them. I asked how much the paid-up capital was, stating that I had heard they had paid up only \$10,000, and they did not deny it. I believe that is the whole amount. They made a construction company to which they let the contracts. SIR ADOLPHE CARON, MINISTER OF MILITIA, is a member of the construction company, and other Tory members of Parliament are members of the railway company and the construction company. There is the

PONTIAC & PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY,

in which MR. CHAPLEAU, Secretary of State, is interested as one of the chief directors, holding about one-eighth of the stock, and this road also has a large subsidy. The

GATINEAU VALLEY RAILWAY

Company is another case. MR. MACKINTOSH, one of the members for Ottawa, is chief promoter, and I believe, president. This road also has a large subsidy. Then there is the

INTERNATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY,

in which MR. POPE, THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS, himself was interested as a large proprietor. This was doubly scandalous, for it was the case of a Minister, and of the Minister of Railways. (Cheers.) That road has a large subsidy also, given to it in order to enable it to exchange its iron rails for steel. Besides that, it was concerned in certain negotiations for the extension of the Can-

A GOLDEN EAR-LAP,

if you deafen their ears with a golden plate, how is the voice of argument, reason, or truth to penetrate those layers. (Loud and prolonged applause.) It can't be done. Take my friend, Mr. Burns, the member of Gloucester, for instance. It is at the end of the session that the railway grants and other favours are brought down. Of what are he and those like him thinking in the meantime? *Where are their eyes fixed while we are engaged debating the public questions of the day?* They are *watching the Treasury benches, wondering whether their appropriation will come down.* And if the impression exists, as, alas! it does exist, that the

PRICE OF AN APPROPRIATION

is an unwavering support, and that an independent vote may adversely affect their chances, who will carry the day? (Cheers.) The side on which the appropriation is will always carry the day, you may be sure. Of course these men are watching for the sop at the end of the session, and they vote accordingly. (Applause and laughter.) I have said

THESE THINGS ARE A DISGRACE TO THE GOVERNMENT, A DISGRACE TO THE MAJORITY IN PARLIAMENT.

Whether they shall be a disgrace to the Conservative party, as a whole, it now remains for that party to say. If the Conservative party choose not to become responsible for these things, if they prefer to disclaim them, if they refuse to be connected with these abuses, they may escape a staggering load now impending on their shoulders, and they may be the saviours of their country. (Cheers.) But *if the party, as a whole, declare these things to be honest, upright, and commendable, or even if they say, Though we would not touch this pitch ourselves, though we are ashamed of it, though we dislike it, still party union, party zeal, leads us to endorse, or not to condemn, the system, they will not, they cannot, escape disgrace and degradation for themselves.* (Cheers.) They are

BOUND TO PERFORM THEIR PUBLIC DUTY,

however painful; they are bound to tell their leaders, and the members whom they elect, to tell them plainly, that they will have neither part nor lot in this matter, that they will not suffer such things to be done in their name. So they will purify their party, and save their country. But if they choose otherwise, they become accomplices in the public disgrace. (Cheers.)

holders, received a very large consideration in excess of anything paid, an enormous profit upon the original stock which he had subscribed, which stock owed its whole value to the subsidy. *Mr. McCarthy also received the presidency of the subsidized line at a salary, according to different statements, of from \$3,000 to \$3,500 a year.* And last session Mr. McCarthy obtained legislation under which this company was authorized to issue, and in case of the assumption of the road by the Government under its reserved rights, the country became bound to pay \$12,000 a mile more in bonds than the existing obligations ; though the whole amount of cost was thus raised to \$32,000 a mile, a sum far in excess of the estimated, and, so far as we could ascertain, of the proper cost. Grave statements were made on this head, and an effort was made to obtain an inquiry, but it was rejected, and the bill was forced through.

The relations I have described are

UNFORTUNATE AND INDEFENSIBLE RELATIONS

as between members of Parliament and railway companies depending for their fortune on the good-will and favour of the Executive which controls the grants and legislation of the day.

There are many other cases which I could mention, for example, **DR. HICKEY'S COMPANY, DR. BERGIN'S COMPANY, AND OTHER COMPANIES.** To cap the climax, *the wholesome legislation of Mr. Mackenzie, which precluded shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway from being members of Parliament, was in effect repealed last session*, so that you may soon expect to have shareholders in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company who have, and will for years to come have, the most important business relations with the Government and with the country, sitting in Parliament and legislating and voting on your concerns. (Cheers.) Then you have

THE BLIND SHARE BUSINESS,

in which a member of the House, trafficking in colonization companies, got an Order-in-Council for a block of land, arranging with the company that he should have an interest in the profits without risking anything ; in which a member of the Government approved the transaction ; and *in which the whole Government now see everything to approve, nothing to condemn.* Then you have

THE GRANTS OF TIMBER LIMITS, COAL LANDS, RANGING LANDS, GOLD LANDS.

Many hundreds of applications were put in, and several hundreds of Orders-in-Council for licenses were passed, some to mem-

bers of Parliament themselves, but mainly to others through the intervention of members. All this is said to be no harm, it is said to be commendable that members of Parliament, as well as others, should take this interest in the development of the country. Talk about the N.P. and what it has done to develop industries, it is not to be compared for rapidity of development to that of

THE TIMBER LIMIT INDUSTRY.

(Cheers and laughter.) Order after order was passed in Council granting to almost every Tory who chose to apply and who had the necessary "influence," timber limits in different parts of the country. *These orders were not to lumbermen, or to those who intended to go into that business, but to Tory lawyers, Tory doctors, Tory storekeepers, Tory hacks, Tory wirepullers, Tory politicians, and Tory members of Parliament.* (Cheers.) These did not go into the business, of course they never thought of it; they intended to make a profit by selling out to those who were to work the limits. I rejoice that a great many of these apples turned out

APPLES OF SODOM.

(Applause.) The business had been "promoted" too largely. There were more orders granted than the real demand justified, and there were a great many limits granted on which there was much less timber than the plunderers expected. But some made a very handsome thing, and all expected to do it, and that expectation is what has created this wholesale *régime* of personal and pecuniary relations between the members of Parliament and the Treasury. It is amusing now to hear some defend themselves on the ground that after all they made nothing out of it! What has that to do with it? They

WENT IN FOR A BIG PROFIT,

and you might as well acquit the thief because the spoons were only brass instead of silver, as discharge these men because they did not realize all their expected gains.

They say there are a few Grits among the many Tories who applied and received Orders-in-Council. Take the lists of applicants and I think you will find there were about 99 *Tories to one Grit*. They say that the fact that one Grit was included proves that it was all right. But *it was*, I believe you will agree, *a scheme for carving up the timber limits and ranching lands and other lands of the North-West largely amongst Tory hacks, and patisans and members of Parliament, a scheme which has developed to such an alarming extent and has led to such unhappy results.* Mr.

White, Minister of the Interior, when he speaks of this matter is fond of saying that very few licenses were issued. But that simply shows the plot did not fully succeed. It does not show that there was no plot. (Cheers.) They were not able to sell their Orders-in-Council, and it was only the *bona fide* lumberers who would take out the licenses; but the orders were issued, the chances were given, the expectations were raised, and the party hacks were saved, or thought they were saved. All this is demonstrated, and this it is that you are asked to condemn. (Cheers.) And *you must remember that the public papers show all that I have spoken of*. If that is so, what may be covered by the secret interests in these and other transactions of which we know nothing? (Hear, hear.) The documents in the case of Messrs Macdonald and Tupper,

LUCKY YOUNG MEN,

fortunate sons of fortunate fathers, who have got all the *best solicitorships in Winnipeg*, the Canadian Pacific, the Hudson's Bay, the Merchants' Bank, *all corporations having dealings with the Government*, show that in these timber limits and other grants of the public domain, there were secret interests; in many of those promoted for their clients Messrs. Macdonald and Tupper had a *very large secret interest themselves*. In one Lieutenant-Governor *Dewdney had an interest*. He valued this affair alone at \$50,000, and their shares in these various grants were estimated at many thousands, for which they gave no consideration, except that they pressed forward the claims of those who wished to secure the grants. What happened with them very likely happened with the others. Then some actually did make great sums, for example, *Mr. Rykert, M.P., who realized an enormous sum for his services or share in one of these grants*. The price paid was \$200,000, of which I believe *Mr. Rykert realized \$90,000, invested in his wife's name*. Then there are the printing jobs and the appointments of sons and near relative of Ministers and members to fat offices; and other matters there are, all of which I would develop if there were time, but I must close. The whole thing is a scandal and an offence.

People, friends of mine, sometimes say to me, "This is a strange state of affairs, you address to these men in Parliament arguments which we think are reasonable and unanswerable. They make little or no attempt to answer them. But you don't get their votes. How is that?" My answer is: *How can you expect me to touch them by arguments? I can't reach their ears*. The blindness of party, the bigotry of faction, is a very difficult thing to penetrate, but if you add

ter is
sim-
that
their
who
ances
were
l, and
d *you*
poken
ests in
(Hear,
d and

he *best*
udson's
ys with
grants
of those
r had a
overnor
\$50,000,
t many
at they
ure the
ed with
xample,
services
200,000,
l in his
ppoint-
s to fat
develop
scanda

strange
uments
y make
et their
pect me
s. The
t thing

